UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,552	06/24/2003	Brian Gonsalves	1033-SS00392	1238

34456 7590 07/27/2005

TOLER & LARSON & ABEL L.L.P.
5000 PLAZA ON THE LAKE STE 265
AUSTIN, TX 78746

EXAMINER	
DANIEL JR, WILLIE J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2686	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/602,552	GONSALVES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Willie J. Daniel, Jr.	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-29,32-39 and 42-46* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19,21-29,32-39 and 42-46* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to application filed on 08 March 2005. **Claims 1-19, 21-29, 32-39,** and **42-46** are now pending in the present application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 9-19, 21-23, 25-29, 32-35, 37-39, 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchiyama (US 6,766,175 B2) in view of Alexis (US 2004/0072544 A1).

Regarding **Claim 1**, Uchiyama discloses a docking station (2) which reads on the claimed "apparatus" comprising:

an interface adapter/wireless cradle (8, 102) which reads on the claimed "wireless wide area network telephone interface" (see col. 5, lines 14-20; col. 8, lines 64-67; col. 10, lines 25-28; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7);

a transceiver (116) to communicate with a cordless telephone (6) which reads on the claimed "wireless local area telephone" (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 7); and

a controller (128) which reads on the claimed "first control module" to transfer a call received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface (8) to the transceiver (6) (see

col. 5, lines 38-50; col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 11; col. 10, lines 35-43; col. 12, lines 53-67; Figs. 1, 7, 9 "ref. 146").

a cordless cradle (16, 122) which reads on the claimed "second data interface" of a second type to communicate with a cordless telephone (6) which reads on the claimed "second type of external device" (see col. 6, lines 46-51; col. 10, lines 1-3; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7), where the interface that connects the phone (e.g., cordless) with the docking station is able to transmit memory and caller ID data. Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device. However, the examiner maintains that the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

In the same field of endeavor, Alexis discloses the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device (109, 110) (see pg. 12, [0092]; pg. 13, [0114]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the cradle (adaptive circuitry 1200) has a universal serial bus (USB) for connecting with other devices. Also, Alexis discloses of having interfaces of the cradle (204) being connected to multiple communication devices (109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature a universal serial bus (USB) interface to communicate with a first type of external device, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 2**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, wherein the first control module (128) transfers the call when a wireless telephone (4) which reads on the claimed "wireless wide area network telephone" is coupled to the wireless wide area network telephone interface (8) (see col. 5, lines 38-50; col. 5, line 60 - col. 6, line 11; col. 10, lines 35-43; col. 12, lines 53-67; Figs. 1, 7, 9 "ref. 146").

Regarding **Claim 3**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, wherein the wireless local area telephone (6) comprises a cordless telephone handset (6) which reads on the claimed "wireless local area handset" (see col. 5, lines 38-40; Figs. 1, 4A).

Regarding **Claim 4**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising a wireless local area telephone (6) having a visual display window (52) (see col. 7, line 60; Figs. 4A, 1, 7).

Regarding **Claim 5**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 4), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 4, wherein the wireless local area telephone (6) comprises a cordless telephone (6) which reads on the claimed "desktop telephone" (see col. 5, lines 14-18; col. 2, lines 4-12; Figs. 4A, 1, 7), where the cordless telephone rests in and communicates with the docking station (2) in which the docking station would be located in a physical location such as wall mounted or desktop.

Regarding **Claim 6**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, wherein the transceiver (116) includes an antenna (114) assembly responsive to a 900 MHz transceiver which reads on the claimed "driver" (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 5, 7 "ref. 118").

Regarding **Claim 9**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1 wherein the wireless wide area network telephone (4) is a wireless telephone (4) which reads on the claimed "PCS telephone" (see col. 5, lines 28-37; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **Claim 10**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising:

a speakerphone (22) which reads on the claimed "speaker" (see col. 8, lines 38-48; Fig. 5, 7);

a function key (74) which reads on the claimed "second control module" to communicate an incoming voice portion of the call received at the wireless wide area network telephone interface (8) to the speaker (22) (see col. 8, lines 38-48; col. 11, lines 13-25; Figs. 2, 5, 7).

Regarding **Claim 11**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising:

a speakerphone (22) which reads on the claimed "microphone" (see col. 8, lines 38-48; col. 11, lines 13-25; Figs. 2, 5, 7); and

the second control module (74) to provide an outgoing voice portion received at the microphone to the wireless wide area network interface (see col. 8, lines 38-48; col. 11, lines 13-25; Figs. 2, 5, 7).

Regarding **Claim 12**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 11), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 11, further comprising an alphanumeric keypad (18) (see col. 8, lines 26-37; col. 11, lines 13-18; Figs. 2, 5, 7).

Regarding **Claim 13**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature a visual display. However, the examiner maintains that the feature a visual display was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature a visual display (see pg. 10, [0079]; pg. 1, [0009]; Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature a visual display, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 14**, Uchiyama discloses the feature responsive to the alphanumeric keypad (18) (see col. 6, lines 51-55; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 10 "ref. 162"), where user enters or other call progress sequences. Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature the visual display.

However, the examiner maintains that the feature the visual display was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature the visual display (see pg. 10, [0079]; pg. 1, [0009]; pg. 5, [0046]; Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature the visual display, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 15**, Uchiyama discloses the feature is responsive to text messages (e.g., caller ID) from the wireless wide area network telephone (4) (see col. 11, lines 33-37,60-67; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 9 "ref. 148 / 150"), where message (e.g., caller ID) of an incoming call from the wireless telephone (4) is received at the docking station (2) and the cordless telephone (6). Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature the visual display. However, the examiner maintains that the feature the visual display was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature the visual display (see pg. 10, [0078-0079]; pg. 1, [0009]; Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature the visual display, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional

landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 16**, Uchiyama discloses the feature is responsive to the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 12, lines 11-29; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 10 "ref. 162"), where the user enters a phone number for an outgoing call from the cordless telephone (6) that is received at the docking station (2). Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature the visual display. However, the examiner maintains that the feature the visual display was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature the visual display (see pg. 10, [0078-0079]; pg. 1, [0009]; Fig. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature the visual display, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 17**, Uchiyama discloses the feature of displaying alphanumeric messages from the wireless wide area network telephone (4) (see col. 11, lines 33-37,60-67; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7, 9 "ref. 148 / 150"), where message (e.g., caller ID) of an incoming call from the wireless telephone (4) is received at the docking station (2) and the cordless telephone (6). Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature the visual display is a liquid crystal display (LCD) capable of displaying video images from an image-capable wireless wide area network telephone. However, the examiner maintains that the feature the visual display is a

liquid crystal display (LCD) capable of displaying video images from an image-capable wireless wide area network telephone was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature the visual display is a liquid crystal display (LCD) capable of displaying video images from an image-capable wireless communication device (108, 220) which reads on the claimed "wireless wide area network telephone" (see pg. 10, [0078-0079]; pg. 1, [0009]; pg. 2, [0028-0029]; pg. 5, [0046]; Figs. 1, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature the visual display is a liquid crystal display (LCD) capable of displaying video images from an image-capable wireless wide area network telephone, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 18**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising a power supply adapter (10, 106) which reads on the claimed "battery charger" for charging a battery in the wireless wide area network telephone (4) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **Claim 19**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 1), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the apparatus (2) of claim 1, further comprising:

a battery charger (10) for charging a battery in the wireless wide area telephone (4) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7); and

a battery charger (10) for charging a battery in the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **Claim 21**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal computer (PC). However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal computer (PC) was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a computer systems (110) which reads on the claimed "personal computer (PC)" (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal computer (PC), in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 22**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal video recording devices (109, 110) which reads on the claimed "camera" (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a camera, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 23**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA). However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA) was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA) (108, 109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028-0029]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a personal data assistant (PDA), in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 25**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface (see pg. 12, [0092]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the first data interface is a universal serial bus (USB) interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 26**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface (see pg. 3, [0031]; pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 6, [0052]; pg. 5, [0046-0047]; pg. 1, [0009]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the interface circuitry (106, 204) is connected to communication devices (109) in which the portable media reader and/or writer interface would be inherent.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the second data interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 27**, Uchiyama discloses a method comprising:

receiving an incoming call signal from a wireless wide area network telephone (4) at a docking station (2) which reads on the claimed "base station" (see col. 11, lines 53-60; col. 5, lines 46-50; Figs. 1, 7, 9); and

initiating communication from the base station (2) to a wireless local area telephone (6) in response to receiving the incoming call signal (see col. 11, lines 53-60; col. 5, lines 46-50; Figs. 1, 7, 9). Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature communicating with an external device (109) through a universal serial bus (USB) interface (see pg. 12, [0092]; pg. 13, [0114]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the cradle (adaptive circuitry 1200) has a universal serial bus (USB) for connecting with other devices. Also, Alexis discloses of having interfaces of the cradle (204) being connected to multiple communication devices (109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 28**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 27), in addition Uchiyama further discloses

the method of claim 27, further comprising charging the wireless wide area network telephone (4) from the base station (2) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **Claim 29**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 28), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the method of claim 28, further comprising charging the wireless local area telephone (6) from the base station (2) (see col. 6, lines 13-19; col. 10, lines 7-10; Figs. 1, 7).

Regarding **Claim 32**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the wherein the external device is a personal computer (PC). However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the external device is a personal computer (PC) was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the external device is a computer systems (110) which reads on the claimed "personal computer (PC)" (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the external device is a personal computer (PC), in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 33**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the external device is a camera. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the external device is a camera was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the external device is a personal video recording devices (109, 110) which reads on the claimed "camera" (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the external device is a camera, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 34**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above (see claim 27), in addition Uchiyama further discloses the method of claim 27, further comprising communicating with an external device (6) through a second standardized interface (16, 122) (see col. 6, lines 46-51; col. 10, lines 1-3; Figs. 1-2, 5, 7).

Regarding **Claim 35**, Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface (see pg. 3, [0031]; pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 6, [0052]; pg. 5, [0046-0047]; pg. 1, [0009]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the interface circuitry (106, 204) is connected to communication devices (109) in which the portable media reader and/or writer interface would be inherent.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature wherein the second standardized interface is a portable media reader and/or writer interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 37**, Uchiyama discloses a method comprising:

receiving an outgoing call request signal at a base station (2) from a wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 12, lines 11-29; Fig. 10); and

initiating from the base station (2) a call to be made from a wireless wide area network telephone (4) in response to receiving the outgoing call request signal (see col. 12, lines 11-29; Fig. 10). Uchiyama fails to disclose having the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface. However, the examiner maintains that the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface was well known in the art, as taught by Alexis.

Alexis further discloses the feature communicating with an external device (109) through a universal serial bus (USB) interface (see pg. 12, [0092]; pg. 13, [0114]; Figs. 1, 15, 4), where the cradle (adaptive circuitry 1200) has a universal serial bus (USB) for connecting with other devices. Also, Alexis discloses of having interfaces of the cradle (204) being connected to multiple communication devices (109, 110) (see pg. 2, [0028]; pg. 2-3, [0031]; Figs. 1, 15, and 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis to have the feature communicating with an external device through a universal serial bus (USB) interface, in order for users to make wireless telephone calls from a conventional landline communication device via a connected interface circuitry, as taught by Alexis (see pg. 1, [0007, 0009]).

Regarding **Claim 38**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 28).

Regarding **Claim 39**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 29).

Regarding **Claim 42**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 32).

Regarding **Claim 43**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 33).

Regarding **Claim 44**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 34).

Regarding **Claim 45**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 35).

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uchiyama (US 6,766,175 B2)** in view of **Alexis (US 2004/0072544 A1)** as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of well known prior art (**MPEP 2144.03**).

Regarding **Claim 7**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above,

(see Claim 6), in addition Uchiyama discloses wherein the driver is to communicate with the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 5, 7). Uchiyama fails to disclose the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz. However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to have the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Uchiyama by specifically having the feature at approximately 2.4 GHz, for the purpose of communicating between the docking station and the cordless telephone.

Regarding **Claim 8**, Uchiyama discloses every limitation claimed, as applied above, (see Claim 6), in addition Uchiyama discloses wherein the driver is to communicate with the wireless local area telephone (6) (see col. 6, lines 55-61; Figs. 1, 5, 7). Uchiyama fails to disclose the feature at approximately 5.8 GHz. However, the examiner takes official notice of the fact that it was well known in the art to have the feature at approximately 5.8 GHz.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Uchiyama by specifically having the feature at approximately 5.8 GHz, for the purpose of communicating between the docking station and the cordless telephone.

Claims 24, 36, 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Uchiyama (US 6,766,175 B2)** in view of **Alexis (US 2004/0072544 A1)** as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of **Harrison et al**. (hereinafter Harrison) **(US 2002/011190 A1)**.

Regarding **Claim 24**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis fails to disclose

having the feature wherein the first type of external device is a digital storage card. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the first type of external device is a digital storage card was well known in the art, as taught by Harrison.

In the same field of endeavor, Harrison discloses the feature wherein the first type of external device is a memory flash card (39) which reads on the claimed "digital storage card" (see pg. 3, [0044]; pg. 1, [0015]; Fig. 2a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis with Harrison to have the feature wherein the first type of external device is a digital storage card, in order to have a base station to back up data for a portable device, as taught by Harrison (see pg. 1, [0012, 0015]).

Regarding **Claim 36**, the combination of Uchiyama and Alexis fails to disclose having the feature wherein the external device is a digital storage card. However, the examiner maintains that the feature wherein the external device is a digital storage card was well known in the art, as taught by Harrison.

Harrison further discloses the feature wherein the external device is a memory flash card (39) which reads on the claimed "digital storage card" (see pg. 3, [0044]; pg. 1, [0015]; Fig. 2a).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Uchiyama and Alexis with Harrison to have the feature wherein the external device is a digital storage card, in order to have a base station to back up data for a portable device, as taught by Harrison (see pg. 1, [0012, 0015]).

Regarding **Claim 46**, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above (see claim 36).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08 March 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's arguments as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims and comments in this section).

4. Regarding Claims 7-8, the applicant did not traverse the examiner's assertion of official notice stated in the action mailed 14 December 2004. As a result, the Examiner's statement hereby is taken to be well-known admitted prior art or common knowledge because the applicant failed to traverse the Examiner's assertion of official notice.

5. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "a camera is not configured for communication over a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN)") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Regarding applicant's argument of claims 22, 33, and 43 on pg. 9, 3rd paragraph, lines 7-8, Alexis discloses a communication device (e.g., personal video recording devices) connected to the docking station (see pg. 2, [0028]; Figs. 1, 15), where the personal video

recording device is able to record video in which video imaging must be accomplished by a component of the device such as a camera or camcorder.

6. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

7. Regarding applicant's argument of claim 23 on pg. 10, 1st paragraph, "Alexis nowhere discloses....interface as a portable media reader and/or writer interface...", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Alexis discloses having a communication device connected to the docking station such as a PDA (see pg. 11, [0085]; Fig. 15).

8. Regarding applicant's argument of claims 26, 35, and 45 on pg. 10, 1st paragraph, "Alexis nowhere discloses....interface as a portable media reader and/or writer interface...", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Alexis discloses having communication devices connected to the docking station such as a computer systems and personal video recording devices (see pg. 2, [0028]), where the devices can record and/or store information.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willie J. Daniel, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-7907. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-873-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WJD,JR
22 July 2005

CHARLES APPIAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER